

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,217	09/14/2005	Boris Adam	10191/3723	1011
26646	7590 10/02/2006		EXAM	INER
KENYON & KENYON LLP			SUGLO, JANET L	
ONE BROAD	WAY			
NEW YORK, NY 10004			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			2857	

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/524,217	ADAM ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Janet Suglo	2857		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was a failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNI 36(a). In no event, however, may a rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 Second     This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ This     Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under Expression 2.	action is non-final. ace except for formal mat			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 6-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 6-10 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or				
Application Papers				
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 08 February 2005 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	: a)⊠ accepted or b)☐ drawing(s) be held in abeya on is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.				
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application		

Application/Control Number: 10/524,217 Page 2

Art Unit: 2857

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed February 8, 2005 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
   The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Independent claim specifies that the processor is connectable to "at least one additional vehicle system." However, there is no initial vehicle system described. It will be assumed that the processor and the at least two pressure sensors are the initial vehicle system for this office action.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 6, 7, 9, and 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zumpano (US Patent 6,513,829).

With respect to **claim 6**, Zumpano teaches a device for impact sensing (col 10, In 52-67), comprising:

a processor (col 10, In 63-65); and

at least two pressure sensors connectable to the processor to communicate at least one pressure value each to the processor, the processor being configured to perform an impact sensing based on the at least one pressure value (col 10, ln 52-67);

wherein the processor is connectable to at least one additional vehicle system to transmit the at least one pressure value to the at least one additional vehicle system (col 13, ln 63-65).

With respect to **claim 7**, Zumpano teaches the at least one additional vehicle system is an injection system (i.e., inflation system injects air into inflatable members) (col 14, ln 13-24).

With respect to **claim 9**, Zumpano teaches the at least one additional vehicle system is configured to control its function as a function of the at least one pressure value (col 14, ln 1-12).

Application/Control Number: 10/524,217 Page 4

Art Unit: 2857

With respect to **claim 10**, Zumpano teaches the at least one pressure value is a differential pressure value (col 12, ln 59-67).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zumpano (US Patent 6,513,829) in view of Bohner et al. (US Patent 6,269,903) (hereinafter "Bohner"). Zumpano teaches all limitations of parent claim 6 as shown above, but does not teach plausibility checking. Bohner teaches plausibility checking on pressure sensor values (Bohner: col 8, ln 1-3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Zumpano to include the plausibility checking of Bohner because this will ensure proper functioning of the pressure sensors (Bohner: col 7, ln 61-63) and ensure that the system is functioning during emergency situations (Bohner: col 2, ln 5-7).

#### Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Application/Control Number: 10/524,217

Art Unit: 2857

Zumpano (US Patent 6,209,908) teaches an inflatable restraint assembly for vehicles.

Stride (US Patent 6,212,456) teaches a pedestrian impact sensor system.

Sparks et al. (US Patent 6,338,010) teaches a multi-sensor module for communicating sensor information over a vehicle data bus.

Breed (US PGPub 2002/0166710) teaches a method and apparatus for deploying airbags.

Eisele et al. (US PGPub 2003/0051530) teaches a device for impact detection in a vehicle.

Roelleke et al. (US PGPub 2003/0140679) teaches a device for side impact detection in a motor vehicle.

Schofield et al. (US Patent 6,302,545) teaches a vehicle control system and method.

Breed et al. (US Patent 6,328,126) teaches a crush sensing vehicle crash sensor.

Application/Control Number: 10/524,217

Art Unit: 2857

Page 6

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Janet Suglo whose telephone number is 571-272-8584. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marc Hoff can be reached on 571-272-2216. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Janet L Suglo September 25, 2006

> MARC S. HOFF SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINES TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800